



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,711	04/22/2002	Kazumi Iijima	KKH-013	8628

7590 05/19/2005  
Rader, Fishman & Grauer  
1233 20th Street N W Suite 501  
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

DESANTO, MATTHEW F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3763

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/030,711

Applicant(s)

IIJIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew F DeSanto

Art Unit

3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minkus et al. (USPN 5460617).

Minkus et al. discloses a plunger with a screw portion, a pair of ring members (34,48), and a plurality of vane members (42,44), a flange with a rib (58) in between the first ring and the flange, (Figures 1-3 and entire reference), but fails to disclose the rings members being disposed apart from each other by .5 mm or more and the interval between the first ring member and the second ring member is less than a distance between a rear surface of the gasket.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to change the size and dimensions of the syringe since this is an obvious matter of design choice. The applicant also fails to provide any criticality and/or unexpected results, therefore it appears that the invention would perform equally as well with any size or dimension, which is what is being taught by the prior art.

Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4 are obvious variations of Minkus.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimber et al. (USPN 6,068,614).

Kimber et al. discloses a plunger with a screw portion; a pair of ring members, and a plurality of vane members, as well as a flange portion and one or two gripping ring members, (Figure 7 and entire reference), but fails to disclose the rings members being disposed apart from each other by .5 mm or more and the interval between the first ring member and the second ring member is less than a distance between a rear surface of the gasket.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to change the size and dimensions of the syringe since this is an obvious matter of design choice. The applicant also fails to provide any criticality and/or unexpected results, therefore it appears that the invention would perform equally as well with any size or dimension, which is what is being taught by the prior art.

Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4 are obvious variations of Kimber et al.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Hirschman et al. (USPN 6042565).

Hirschman et al. discloses a plunger with a screw portion; a pair of ring members, and a plurality of vane members, as well as a flange portion and one or two gripping ring members (Figures 1, 2A, 2C, 2D, 4A, and entire reference), but fails to disclose the rings members being disposed apart from each other by .5 mm or more and the interval between the first ring member and the second ring member is less than a distance between a rear surface of the gasket.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to change the size and dimensions of the syringe since this is an obvious matter of design choice. The applicant also fails to provide any criticality and/or unexpected results, therefore it appears that the invention would perform equally as well with any size or dimension, which is what is being taught by the prior art.

Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4 are an obvious variations of Hirschman et al.

5. Claims 1, 2, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanley et al. (USPN 5,685,864).

Shanley et al. discloses a plunger with a screw portion, a pair of ring members, and a plurality of vane members, a flange with a rib in between the first ring and the flange, (Figures 1-3 and entire reference), but fails to disclose the rings members being disposed apart from each other by .5 mm or more and the interval between the first ring member and the second ring member is less than a distance between a rear surface of the gasket.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to change the size and dimensions of the syringe since this is an obvious matter of design choice. The applicant also fails to provide any criticality and/or unexpected results, therefore it appears that the invention would perform equally as well with any size or dimension, which is what is being taught by the prior art.

Therefore, claims 1, 2 are obvious variations of Shanley et al.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Minkus et al., or Kimber et al. or Hirschman et al.

Minkus et al., or Hirschman et al. or Kimber et al. teach the claimed invention but fail to disclose eight pieces of the vane member, which are arranged at regular intervals and at central angles of 45 degrees.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to make the vane members out of eight pieces or more because this change in number of the vane members is a mere matter of design choice. This is a duplication of the components of the prior art device, and thus has been held in the courts as a "design consideration within the skill of the art." [See In re Harza, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960).]

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew F DeSanto whose telephone number is 571-272-4957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick LUCCHESI can be reached on (571) 272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Matthew DeSanto

Art Unit 3763

May 16, 2005



**NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**